

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/509,932	09/13/2000	Dagmar Antoni-Zimmermann	788-027	1908
75	90 09/09/2002			
James V Costigan Hedman Gibson & Costigan 1185 Avenue of the Americas			EXAMINER	
			JAGOE, DONNA A	
New York, NY	, NY 10036-2601 ART UNIT PAPE		PAPER NUMBER	
•			1614	
			DATE MAILED: 09/09/2002 /	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. \$	Applicati n N . Applicant(s)		
Advisory Action	09/509,932	ANTONI-ZIMMERM	IANN ET AL.
,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Donna A. Jagoe	1614	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	rrespondence add	fress
THE REPLY FILED 12 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE 1 Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	ly to a ation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final reject	ion.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.136(a).	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The apportion of the final originally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>12 August 2002</u>. Ap 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 			orth in
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
 (c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or 	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE: .	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	IS.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejecti	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which wer	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			•
Claim(s) allowed:		•	
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Exami	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).		•.
10. Other:	,,,	PRIMARY EXAMIN	is Er L
		melel	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: by using the claim language "consisting essentially of" applicant has not shown that the additional components would materially change the characteristics of the applicants invention. Further, pages 3 to 5 of applicants specification does not exclude the addition of additional biocidal ingredients (specifically, page 3, line 30-31).

